

TRANSCRIPT PREPARED BY THE CLERK OF THE LEGISLATURE
Transcriber's Office
FLOOR DEBATE

May 15, 2001

LB 536

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Does any of those plants operate without taking the subsidy that exists right now, the state subsidy?

SENATOR DIERKS: I think they do, Senator Chambers, but I can't tell you which ones they are. If I were to guess, I would guess that the plant at Blair, maybe the one at Columbus.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Why would they not be taking the subsidy, if you know?

SENATOR DIERKS: Well, the subsidy is available, I think, because they're doing construction or adding on. I think they've done all that.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Did they take the subsidy at some point in their existence, if you know?

SENATOR DIERKS: Well, I think they did.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Could they have reached the state...the stage they find themselves at now had they rejected that subsidy?

SENATOR DIERKS: Well, I don't know that, Senator.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Thank you, Senator Dierks. Members of the Legislature, I'm going to keep hammering on that point because I have read for you an example of a man who changed the nature of his ethanol plant in Louisiana in order to get some subsidies in Louisiana. He was using molasses from Brazil until the Louisiana Legislature said if you're going to make ethanol in this state you have to use Louisiana products. Louisiana was giving a 20-cent per gallon subsidy. The Legislature said no more, no subsidy, and this man immediately filed bankruptcy. His plant could not operate without the subsidy. Why do you think Senator Dierks and his cohorts are fighting so hard to keep the subsidy? Despite the glowing reports they try to give us, they know these plants need these subsidies. The speculators have told them that, the purveyors or those who move the alcohol have told them that, and those who are selling it have told them that. Senator Raikes had an amendment that he